

REMARKS

Applicants filed on December 23, 2011 a response to the outstanding office action mailed July 27, 2011. Subsequent thereto, the undersigned considered the outstanding rejections with the Examiner. Applicants in addition to the response filed December 23, 2011, are providing the present amendment to the claims in order to move prosecution forward.

Based upon applicants understanding of the manner of application of the reference Ruppel (U.S. Patent No. 6,287,676 B1) against the pending claims, applicants have amended the claims to clarify the nature of the claimed decorative elements, i.e., that each decorative element forms an image in itself and is not simply an embossment which must be combined with other embossments to provide a pattern or an image, and to further emphasize that only one of the two patterns as claimed is apparent on a respective outer surface of the material. Support for these amendments is shown in Figures 3-5 of the captioned application. An individual protrusion or embossment of Ruppel is not a decorative element as claimed by applicants since such embossment does not provide an image in itself but rather

6768/USSN 10/591,392
Group Art Unit 1788


must be viewed in combination with other embossments to be apparent as a pattern. Ruppel also does not provide any recognition of providing different patterns on opposite outside surfaces of the paper sheet described.

Accordingly, based on the above and the arguments set forth in the December 23, 2011 response, applicants submit that the claims are not obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of the §103 rejections is requested.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are urged.

Respectfully submitted,

GIOVANNI NENCIONI ET AL

By 

Mary J. Breiner, Attorney
Registration No. 33,161
BREINER & BREINER, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 320160
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-0160

Telephone: (703) 684-6885